



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,341	03/26/2004	Satoshi Kotaka	88512.0002	8251
26/021 7590 06/13/2008 HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P. 1999 AVENUE OF THE STARS SUITE 1400 LOS ANGELES, CA 90067				
EXAMINER				
BAKER, CHARLOTTE M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2625				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/13/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/810,341

Applicant(s)

KOTAKA ET AL.

Examiner

CHARLOTTE M. BAKER

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-16 and 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takatsu (6,535,702) in view of Yajima et al. (6,862,104).

Regarding claim 1: Takatsu discloses a display unit (Fig. 1, user interface section 6); an input unit (Fig. 1, user interface section 6) including a button (soft keys on touch panel); a facsimile control section (Fig. 1, image data processing section 2) for executing jobs including: a read job for generating facsimile data based on a manuscript to be transmitted via facsimile (col. 3, ln. 33-67); a facsimile transmission job for transmitting facsimile data to a specified facsimile destination (col. 3, ln. 33-67); a facsimile reception job for receiving and storing transmitted facsimile data (Fig. 1, image data processing section, image data storage device, col. 3, ln. 33-67); and print job for printing facsimile data received and stored by the facsimile reception job (col. 3, ln. 33-67).

Takatsu fails to specifically address a display/input unit control section for operating the display and the input unit so that contents of the jobs not yet executed by the facsimile

control section are to be displayed one by one on the display unit in order each time an user presses the button on the input unit.

Yajima et al. disclose and a display/input unit control section (Fig. 1, control panel portion 1 which includes display portion 2 and control portion 3) for operating the display and the input unit (input device made up of a transparent touch panel over the screen of the display portion 2, operator can perform input by touching the touch panel, col. 4, ln. 24-38) so that contents of the jobs not yet executed (Fig. 2, status of fax jobs; "sending", "waiting") by the facsimile control section (Fig. 2, Fax Job) are to be displayed one by one (Fig. 2, "1", "2", "3") on the display unit (Fig. 1, display portion 2) in order (Fig. 2, "1", "2", "3" and col. 5, ln. 4-9) each time an user presses the button (touching the touch panel, col. 4, ln. 24-38) on the input unit (input device made up of a transparent touch panel over the screen of the display portion 2, operator can perform input by touching the touch panel, col. 4, ln. 24-38).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a display/input unit control section to display the contents of jobs not yet executed in order to allow the user to readily and correctly check the transmission reservation status of the data transmission paths and confirm his/her own transmission reservation as taught by Yajima et al. (col. 2, ln. 25-33).

Regarding claim 2: Takatsu in view of Yajima et al. satisfy all the elements of claim 1.

Takatsu fail to specifically address wherein the display/input unit control unit, by way of operation on the input unit while the contents of the associated job are displayed on the display unit, causes the display unit and the input unit to operate as units that the user can issue an instruction to cancel the job.

Yajima et al. further disclose wherein the display/input unit control unit (Fig. 1, control panel portion 1 which includes display portion 2 and control portion 3), by way of operation on the input unit (input device made up of a transparent touch panel over the screen of the display portion 2, operator can perform input by touching the touch panel, col. 4, ln. 24-38) while the contents of the associated job are displayed on the display unit (Fig. 2, fax jobs), causes the display unit (Fig. 1, display portion 2) and the input unit (input device made up of a transparent touch panel over the screen of the display portion 2, operator can perform input by touching the touch panel, col. 4, ln. 24-38) to operate as units that the user can issue an instruction (touch the “stop/delete” portion shown in Fig. 2) to cancel the job.

Regarding claim 3: Arguments analogous to those stated in the rejection of claim 1 are applicable.

In addition, Takatsu discloses wherein the facsimile control section (Fig. 1, image data processing section 2) executes queuing facsimile transmission jobs and print jobs (col. 7, ln. 35-50).

Takatsu fails to specifically address and in the order of the read job and the facsimile transmission job in response to a user's operation on the input unit, and in case that the facsimile transmission jobs are present, the contents of the facsimile transmission jobs are to be displayed in inverse order of management start time of each facsimile transmission job.

Yajima et al. further disclose and in the order of the read job (Fig. 2, the jobs are shown in the order in which they were presented as evidenced by time associated with each job) and the facsimile transmission job (Fig. 2, fax job) in response to a user's operation on the input unit (input device made up of a transparent touch panel over the screen of the display portion 2,

operator can perform input by touching the touch panel, col. 4, ln. 24-38), and in case that the facsimile transmission jobs are present (Fig. 2, displaying the status of the fax jobs), the contents of the facsimile transmission jobs are to be displayed in inverse order of management start time (Examiner interprets that inverse order is that the oldest job is shown first and then goes in order from oldest job to newest job as displayed in Fig. 2) of each facsimile transmission job (Fig. 2, fax job).

Regarding claim 4: Takatsu in view of Yajima et al. satisfy all the elements of claim 3.

Arguments analogous to those stated in the rejection of claim 2 are applicable.

Regarding claim 5: Arguments analogous to those stated in the rejection of claim 3 are applicable.

In addition, Takatsu fails to specifically address and in case that the print jobs are present, the contents of the print jobs are to be displayed in inverse order of management start time.

Yajima et al. further disclose and in case that the print jobs are present (Fig. 2, print job selection), the contents of the print jobs (Fig. 2, print job selection) are to be displayed in inverse order of management start time (Examiner interprets that inverse order is that the oldest job is shown first and then goes in order from oldest job to newest job as displayed in Fig. 2).

Regarding claim 6: Takatsu in view of Yajima et al. satisfy all the elements of claim 5.

Arguments analogous to those stated in the rejection of claim 2 are applicable.

Regarding claim 7: Arguments analogous to those stated in the rejection of claim 1 are applicable.

In addition, Takatsu fails to specifically address a job execution section for executing a plurality of job types in parallel.

Yajima et al. further disclose a job execution section (Figs. 2 and 3, able to select print jobs, e-mail jobs and fax jobs) for executing a plurality of job types in parallel (Figs. 2 and 3, print jobs, e-mail jobs and fax jobs).

Regarding claim 8: Takatsu in view of Yajima et al. satisfy all the elements of claim 7.

Arguments analogous to those stated in the rejection of claims 1 and 3.

Regarding claim 9: Takatsu in view of Yajima et al. satisfy all the elements of claim 7.

Takatsu further discloses wherein the job execution section executes a reception job for receiving facsimile data (col. 3, ln. 54-67) and a non-reception job different from the reception job (col. 4, ln. 66 through col. 5, ln. 12).

Takatsu fails to specifically address and wherein the display/input unit control section operates the display unit and the input unit so that contents of the jobs not yet executed by the job execution section are to be displayed in the order of the non-reception job and the reception job each time the user presses the button on the input unit.

Yajima et al. further disclose and wherein the display/input unit control section (Fig. 1, control panel portion 1 which includes display portion 2 and control portion 3) operates the display unit and the input unit (input device made up of a transparent touch panel over the screen of the display portion 2, operator can perform input by touching the touch panel, col. 4, ln. 24-38) so that contents of the jobs not yet executed by the job execution section (Figs. 2 and 3, able to select print jobs, e-mail jobs and fax jobs) are to be displayed in the order of the non-reception job and the reception job (waiting to be sent or sent) each time the user presses the button (touching the touch panel, col. 4, ln. 24-38) on the input unit (input device made up of a

transparent touch panel over the screen of the display portion 2, operator can perform input by touching the touch panel, col. 4, ln. 24-38).

Regarding claim 10: Takatsu in view of Yajima et al. satisfy all the elements of claim 7.

Takatsu further discloses executes a copy-related job (status of a job in progress, col. 4, ln. 11-14) executed to produce a copy of a manuscript (copying of an original document, col. 4, ln. 11-14) and a non-copy related (facsimile transmission, Fig. 5 and facsimile job, col. 4, ln. 18-22) executed for a purpose different from production of the copy of the manuscript (facsimile transmission, Fig. 5).

Takatsu fails to specifically address wherein the job execution unit and wherein the display/input unit control section operates the display unit and the input unit so that contents of the jobs not yet executed by the job execution section are to be displayed in the order of the copy-related job and the non-copy-related job each time the user presses the button on the input unit.

Yajima et al. disclose wherein the job execution unit (Figs. 1-3, able to select print jobs, e-mail jobs, copy and fax jobs) and wherein the display/input unit control section (Fig. 1, control panel portion 1 which includes display portion 2 and control portion 3) operates the display unit and the input unit (input device made up of a transparent touch panel over the screen of the display portion 2, operator can perform input by touching the touch panel, col. 4, ln. 24-38) so that contents of the jobs not yet executed by the job execution section (Figs. 1-3, able to select print jobs, e-mail jobs, copy and fax jobs) are to be displayed in the order of the copy-related job and the non-copy-related job (Figs. 2 and 3) each time the user presses the button (touching the touch panel, col. 4, ln. 24-38) on the input unit (input device made up of a transparent touch

panel over the screen of the display portion 2, operator can perform input by touching the touch panel, col. 4, ln. 24-38).

Regarding claim 11: Takatsu in view of Yajima et al. satisfy all the elements of claim 7.

Takatsu fails to specifically address wherein the display/input unit control section specifies the display order of jobs.

Yajima et al. further disclose wherein the display/input unit control section (Fig. 1, control panel portion 1 which includes display portion 2 and control portion 3) specifies the display order of jobs (Figs. 2 and 3, "1", "2", "3").

Regarding claim 12: Arguments analogous to those stated in the rejection of claims 1 and 7 are applicable.

In addition, Takatsu fails to specifically address a cancellation instruction acceptance section for executing an instruction input await processing for awaiting an operation on the input unit in a state where information to prompt input of an instruction on whether to cancel an arbitrary job managed as a running or waiting job by the facsimile control section is displayed on the display unit, wherein one of jobs is selected by way of a predetermined algorithm from the running or waiting jobs by the facsimile control section when the button on the input unit is pressed to cancel the job, and wherein the cancellation instruction acceptance section executes the instruction input await processing on the selected job.

Yajima et al. further disclose a cancellation instruction acceptance section (Figs. 2 and 3, "stop/delete") for executing an instruction (instructions associated with the setup conditions and task operations of the information transmitting apparatus, col. 4, ln. 19-21) input await processing for awaiting an operation on the input unit (input device made up of a transparent

touch panel over the screen of the display portion 2, operator can perform input by touching the touch panel, col. 4, ln. 24-38) in a state where information to prompt input of an instruction on whether to cancel an arbitrary job (Figs. 2 and 3, “stop/delete”) managed as a running or waiting job (Figs. 2 and 3, sending or waiting) by the facsimile control section (Fig. 2, fax job) is displayed on the display unit (Fig. 1, display portion 2), wherein one of jobs is selected by way of a predetermined algorithm (algorithm inherently contained in microcomputer of information transmitting apparatus and runs according to selection made on touch panel, col. 6, ln. 66 through col. 7, ln. 4) from the running or waiting jobs (Figs. 2 and 3, sending or waiting) by the facsimile control section (Fig. 2, fax job) when the button on the input unit (input device made up of a transparent touch panel over the screen of the display portion 2, operator can perform input by touching the touch panel, col. 4, ln. 24-38) is pressed to cancel the job (Figs. 2 and 3, “stop/delete”), and wherein the cancellation instruction acceptance section (Figs. 2 and 3, “stop/delete” selected) executes the instruction input await processing on the selected job (input made by touching the touch panel, col. 4, ln. 24-38).

Regarding claim 13: Takatsu in view of Yajima et al. satisfy all the elements of claim 12.

Takatsu fails to specifically address wherein the predetermined algorithm used by the cancellation instruction acceptance section is an algorithm whereby in case information concerning the job managed as the running or waiting job by the facsimile control section is displayed on the display unit, the job is selected.

Yajima et al. further disclose wherein the predetermined algorithm (algorithm inherently contained in microcomputer of information transmitting apparatus and runs according to selection made on touch panel, col. 6, ln. 66 through col. 7, ln. 4) used by the cancellation

instruction acceptance section (Figs. 2 and 3, “stop/delete” selected) is an algorithm whereby in case information concerning the job managed as the running or waiting job (Figs. 2 and 3, sending or waiting) by the facsimile control section (Fig. 2, fax job) is displayed on the display unit (Fig. 1, display portion 2), the job is selected (selected via touch panel, col. 4, ln. 24-38).

Regarding claim 14: Takatsu in view of Yajima et al. satisfy all the elements of claim 12.

Takatsu fails to specifically address wherein the predetermined algorithm used by the cancellation instruction acceptance section is an algorithm whereby in case the facsimile control section is executing the read job, the read job is selected, whereby in case the facsimile control section is not executing the read job and the facsimile control section is managing the facsimile transmission job as a running or waiting job, the facsimile transmission job is selected, and whereby in case the facsimile control section is not executing the read job and the facsimile control section is not managing a facsimile transmission job as a running or waiting job, but managing the print job as a running or waiting job, the print job is selected.

Yajima et al. further disclose wherein the predetermined algorithm (algorithm inherently contained in microcomputer of information transmitting apparatus and runs according to selection made on touch panel, col. 6, ln. 66 through col. 7, ln. 4) used by the cancellation instruction acceptance section (Figs. 2 and 3, “stop/delete” selected) is an algorithm whereby in case the facsimile control section (Fig. 2, fax job) is executing the read job (scanning the document to fax), the read job is selected, whereby in case the facsimile control section (Fig. 2, fax job) is not executing the read job and the facsimile control section (Fig. 2, fax job) is managing the facsimile transmission job as a running or waiting job (Figs. 2 and 3, sending or

waiting), the facsimile transmission job is selected (Fig. 2, fax job), and whereby in case the facsimile control section (Fig. 2, fax job) is not executing the read job and the facsimile control section is not managing a facsimile transmission job (Fig. 2, fax job) as a running or waiting job (Figs. 2 and 3, sending or waiting), but managing the print job (Figs. 1-3, print job selection) as a running or waiting job (in progress or waiting), the print job is selected (select print job on touch panel).

Regarding claim 15: Takatsu in view of Yajima et al. satisfy all the elements of claim 12.

Takatsu fails to specifically address wherein the facsimile control section manages a plurality of the facsimile transmission jobs and a plurality of the print jobs, and wherein the predetermined algorithm used by the cancellation instruction acceptance section is an algorithm whereby in case the facsimile control section is executing the read job, the read job is selected, whereby in case the facsimile control section is not executing the read job and the facsimile control section is managing one or more facsimile transmission jobs as one or more running or waiting jobs, the facsimile transmission job whose management start time by the facsimile control section is the latest is selected, and whereby in case the facsimile control section is not executing a read job and the facsimile control section is not managing a facsimile transmission job as a running or waiting job but managing one or more print jobs as one or more running or waiting jobs, a print job whose management start time by the facsimile control section is the earliest is selected.

Yajima et al. further disclose wherein the facsimile control section (Fig. 2, fax job) manages a plurality of the facsimile transmission jobs (Fig. 2, fax jobs) and a plurality of the

print jobs (Figs. 1-3, print job selected), and wherein the predetermined algorithm (algorithm inherently contained in microcomputer of information transmitting apparatus and runs according to selection made on touch panel, col. 6, ln. 66 through col. 7, ln. 4) used by the cancellation instruction acceptance section (Figs. 2 and 3, “stop/delete” selected) is an algorithm whereby in case the facsimile control section (Fig. 2, fax job) is executing the read job (Fig. 2, document to be faxed is scanned), the read job is selected (Fig. 2, fax job), whereby in case the facsimile control section (Fig. 2, fax job) is not executing the read job and the facsimile control section is managing one or more facsimile transmission jobs (Fig. 2, fax jobs) as one or more running or waiting jobs (Fig. 2, sending or waiting), the facsimile transmission job (Fig. 2, fax jobs) whose management start time (Fig. 2, time) by the facsimile control section is the latest is selected (Fig. 2, most current), and whereby in case the facsimile control section is not executing a read job (not scanning a document to fax) and the facsimile control section is not managing a facsimile transmission job as a running or waiting job (Fig. 2, sending or waiting) but managing one or more print jobs (Figs. 1-3, print job selected) as one or more running or waiting jobs (in progress or waiting), a print job whose management start time by the facsimile control section is the earliest is selected (selected via touch panel).

Regarding claim 16: Takatsu satisfies all the elements of claim 12.

Takatsu fails to specifically address wherein the instruction input await processing executed by the cancellation instruction acceptance section changes a target job when a predetermined operation is made on the input unit.

Yajima et al. further disclose wherein the instruction input await processing (input made by touching the touch panel, col. 4, ln. 24-38) executed by the cancellation instruction acceptance section (Figs. 2 and 3, “stop/delete” selected) changes a target job when a predetermined operation is made on the input unit (input device made up of a transparent touch panel over the screen of the display portion 2, operator can perform input by touching the touch panel, col. 4, ln. 24-38).

Regarding claim 18: Arguments analogous to those stated in the rejection of claim 12 are applicable.

Regarding claim 19: Takatsu in view of Yajima et al. satisfy all the elements of claim 18. Arguments analogous to those stated in the rejection of claim 12 are applicable.

In addition, Takatsu discloses a scanner (Fig. 1, scanning section 1); determines whether jobs are present in the order of the read job, the facsimile transmission job, the print job, and the facsimile reception job and selects the first detected job (job number, col. 4, ln. 56 through col. 5, ln. 12 and job status, col. 7, ln. 35-50).

Takatsu fails to specifically address the cancellation instruction acceptance section.

Yajima et al. disclose the cancellation instruction acceptance section (Figs. 2 and 3, “stop/delete” selected).

Regarding claim 20: Takatsu in view of Yajima et al. satisfy all the elements of claim 18. Arguments analogous to those stated in the rejection of claim 9 are applicable.

Regarding claim 21: Takatsu in view of Yajima et al. satisfy all the elements of claim 18.

Arguments analogous to those stated in the rejection of claim 10 are applicable.

In addition, Takatsu further discloses determines whether jobs are present in the order of the copy-related job and the non-copy-related job and selects the first detected job (col. 7, ln. 35 through col. 9, ln. 29).

Takatsu fails to specifically address the cancellation instruction acceptance section.

Yajima et al. disclose the cancellation instruction acceptance section (Figs. 2 and 3, “stop/delete” selected).

Regarding claim 22: Takatsu in view of Yajima et al. satisfy all the elements of claim 7.

Takatsu fails to specifically address wherein the cancellation instruction acceptance section sets the predetermined algorithm.

Yajima et al. disclose wherein the cancellation instruction acceptance section (Figs. 2 and 3, “stop/delete” selected) sets the predetermined algorithm (algorithm inherently contained in microcomputer of information transmitting apparatus and runs according to selection made on touch panel, col. 6, ln. 66 through col. 7, ln. 4).

4. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takatsu in view of Yajima et al. and further in view of Sato (6,892,811).

Regarding claim 17: Takatsu in view of Yajima et al. satisfy all the elements of claim 12.

Takatsu fails to specifically address wherein the facsimile control section.

Yajima et al. further disclose wherein the facsimile control section (Fig. 2, fax job).

Takatsu in view of Yajima et al. fail to specifically address cancels the job without making an inquiry to the user about whether to cancel the job in case a job must be canceled.

Sato discloses cancels the job without making an inquiry to the user about whether to cancel the job in case a job must be canceled (job is canceled due to an error in the apparatus without intervening the user, col. 8, ln. 36-38).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include cancelling a job without user intervention in order to halt the apparatus in the event of a failure.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHARLOTTE M. BAKER whose telephone number is (571)272-7459. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Coles can be reached on 571-272-7402. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/C. M. B./

Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/Edward L. Coles/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625